

REMARKS

Applicants repeat the amendments and arguments they made in their previous response to Office Action accompanied by the Request for Continued Examination filed herewith.

Claims 5, 7, 9, 21-23, 27 and 29-30 are pending in the instant specification. Applicants have amended claims 5 and 21. Support for these amendment can be found, for example, from claims 8 and 24 as previously presented. Applicants have canceled claims 1-3, 6, 8, 18-20, 24-26 and 28, herein, and reserve the right to pursue these claims in a continuation application. No new matter is added.

Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to claims 6 and 28 for improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of the previous claim. Applicants have canceled claims 6 and 28 rendering this objection moot.

Claim Rejections

35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claim 8, on page 4 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for indefiniteness. The Examiner asserted that the term “oxygen tensions” in claim 8 did not have clear and positive antecedent basis. Applicants have amended canceled claim 8, rendering this rejection moot..

35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-2, 5-6 and 9 on pages 5-8 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) for being anticipated by Poellinger *et al.* U.S. Publication No. 2002-0048794 (“Poellinger”). The Examiner alleged that Poellinger teaches establishing a protein interaction map according to the limitations of claims 1-2, 5-6 and 9. Applicants have canceled claims 1, 2, and 6 rendering this rejection moot as it regards these claims. To facilitate prosecution, Applicants have also amended claim 5 to add the limitation of claim 8 which is not included in this rejection. Claim 9 depends from claim 5 and thus takes on all of its limitations. Thus,

Inventor: Stamler
U.S.S.N. 09/977,693

Applicants assert that claims 5 and 9 are not anticipated by Poellinger and respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 18-22, 25 and 26 for obviousness over *Martin et al.* Biochemical and Biophysical Research Communications 275:764-767 (2000) (“Martin”) over *Klein et al.* US Statutory Invention Registration H1892 (“Klein”). Applicants have canceled claims 1-3, 18-20, 25 and 26 rendering this rejection moot as it regards these claims. To facilitate prosecution, Applicants have also amended claim 21, from which claim 22 depends, to take on the limitations of claim 24, now canceled. The Examiner did not reject claim 24 as obvious over Martin in light of Klein, thus Applicants submit that claim 21 cannot be obvious with the limitations of claim 24. Claim 22 depends from claim 21 and thus takes on all of its limitations. Thus, Applicants assert that claims 21 and 22 are not obvious over Martin in light of Klein and respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner stated that claims 7 and 23-24 were objected to for being dependent upon a rejected claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants have canceled claim 24. Applicants have also amended claim 5 from which claim 7 depends to take on the limitations of claim 8. Applicants have also amended claim 21 to take on the limitations of claim 24. In light of these amendments, Applicants submit that claims 7 and 23 are now in condition for allowance.

Inventor: Stamler
U.S.S.N. 09/977,693

CONCLUSION

A favorable action on the merits is respectfully requested. If further discussion of this case is deemed helpful, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below, and is assured of full cooperation in progressing the instant claims to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean M. Coughlin/
Ivor R. Elrifi, Reg. No. 39,529
Sean M. Coughlin, Reg. No. 48,593
Attorneys for Applicants
c/o Mintz, Levin
Telephone: (617) 542 6000
Fax: (617) 542 2241
Customer No. 30623

Dated: October 31, 2007

ACTIVE 4177568v.1